



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

(HO)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/049,861 03/27/98 TANAKA

H JA996088

LM12/0518

G MARLIN KNIGHT  
IBM CORPORATION  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW  
5600 COTTLE ROAD L2PA/0142  
SAN JOSE CA 95193

EXAMINER

DAVIS, D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2754

13

DATE MAILED:

05/18/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office  
ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Paper No. 13

Application Number: 09/049,861  
Filing Date: March 27, 1998  
Appellant(s): TANAKA ET AL.

**MAILED**  
**MAY 18 2000**  
**Group 2700**

---

G. Marlin Knight  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

*Review d  
MM SP 2652  
1/20/01*

This is in response to appellant's brief on appeal filed March 13, 2000.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

**(3)    *Status of Claims***

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4)    *Status of Amendments After Final***

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5)    *Summary of Invention***

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

**(6)    *Issues***

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

**(7)    *Grouping of Claims***

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 5-12 do not stand or fall together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

**(8)    *ClaimsAppealed***

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(9) Prior Art of Record**

JP 6-111294	Ishihara	4-1994
JP 6-290452	Matsumura et al	10-1994
JP 5-307748	Sato	11-1993

**(10) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Ishihara (JP 6-111294) or Matsumura et al (JP 6-290452).

Claims 5, 7-9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Sato (JP 5-307748)

Claims 5-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Samoto (JP 4-38716).

**(11) Response to Argument**

Appellants assert the following in the second full paragraph on page 5:

Ishihara JP6-111294 teaches to [sic] use of a pattern of bumps which is claimed to optimize durability of the slider while preventing "attraction" of the slider surface to the disk. Matsumura, et al., JP6-290452 teaches the burning of holes in a carbon substrate. Sato JP5-307748 teaches the formation of bumps on the head parking area which have no sharp angles. Samoto JP4-38716 teaches the use of concentric or spiral groove in the landing zone. Applicants respectfully disagree that these references anticipate the claims as amended above.

Whether the applied prior art uses a pattern of bumps to prevent "attraction" or stiction; burns holes in a carbon substrate; forms bumps with not sharp angles or uses a concentric spiral groove is moot to the *claimed invention*. Appellants claim "a circumferential bump zone adjacent to said free zone, the bump zone being formed with bumps protruding from the surface of said disk, the free zone having no bumps". The applied prior art discloses, and therefore anticipates, "a circumferential bump zone adjacent to said free zone, the bump zone being formed with bumps protruding from the surface of said disk, the free zone having no bumps".

Appellants assert in the first full paragraph on page 6 that the "claim language requires that 'the minimum fly height area of said slider' to be 'positioned over' the free zone area when landing said slider". The applied prior art, as required by the claims discloses "a landing position control unit for moving the slider so that the minimum fly height area of said slider is positioned over the free zone of said disk storage medium when landing said slider". This claim language is more than applicable to the applied prior art and is in agreement with the known movement of a slider with respect to a

landing or parking area of a disk. In other words, since the slider is landing on a landing zone that would be location that the slider is "positioned over" over the free zone, which is a part of the landing zone, when "a minimum fly height" is reached, e.g. before the slider contacts the landing zone.

Similarly appellants assert the following in the paragraph bridging page 6 and 7:

Claim 9 as method [sic] includes the step of "reducing a rotation rate of the disk to allow a portion of the air bearing surface not having the lowest flying height to contact the textured area of the landing zone first".

This step is more than applicable to the applied prior art and is in agreement with the known movement of a slider with respect to a landing or parking area of a disk. Since the slider is landing, there would be a reduction of rotation rate of a disk with a portion of the air bearing surface. Also since the applied prior art shows an even air bearing surface, the portion of the air bearing surface not having the lowest flying, i.e. no surface, would contact the texture area of the landing zone first.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

  
Respectfully submitted,  
David D. Davis  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2754

ddd  
May 17, 2000

G MARLIN KNIGHT  
IBM CORPORATION  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW  
5600 COTTELE ROAD L2PA/0142  
SAN JOSE, CA 95193